

MINUTES
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
BRIDGE COMMITTEE MEETING**
March 22, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor, Commission Conference Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan

**** Frequently Used Acronyms List attached.**

Committee Members:

Keith Cooper, MDOT - Vice-Chair
Don Disselkoen, MAC
Wayne Harrall, KCRC, via Telephone
Bill McEntee, CRA
Brian Vilmont, Prein & Newhof

Rebecca Curtis, MDOT – Chair
Al Halbeisen, OHM Advisors
Joanna Johnson, RCKC/CRA, via Telephone
Gary Mekjian, MML, via Telephone

Support Staff:

Scott Bershing, MTU, via Telephone
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Chris Gilbertson, MTU
Mark Holmes, DTMB/CSS
Polly Kent, MDOT

Members Absent:

Brad Wieferich, MDOT

Public Present:

None

1. Welcome - Call-To-Order - Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:06 p.m.; everyone present was introduced.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda (Action Items):

3.1. - Approval of the February 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

3.2. – Approval of the Bridge Section of 2017 Roads and Bridges Annual Report

J. Johnson made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda items stated above; A. Halbeisen seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. P. Kent and J. Johnson have reviewed the documents for the 2017 annual report that are out on Sharepoint and have provided comments.

4. Up date Items:

4.1. – FY 2018 \$2M TAMC Supplemental Budget for Local Culvert Inspection –

C. Gilbertson

4.1.1. – MTU Report on Local Agency Culvert Survey

MTU sent out the Culvert Survey to the local agencies and received good feedback.

Eighty-one agencies expressed interest in participating in the culvert project.

4.1.1.1. – Map of Survey Results (Attachment 3)

S. Bershing created and provided in the meeting packet to the committee a map showing the local agencies that stated that they were interested in participating in the pilot culvert project based on the three tiers. The map boundaries are set up by zip code and not by the actual boundaries of the city. The map shows a nice distribution of the three tiers for the project. The map also illustrates where the MDOT mapping project has already been conducted. The Tiers are as follows: Tier 1.) – Agencies with no culvert data collected; Tier 2.) – Agencies that have a few culverts located and inspected; and, Tier 3.) – Agencies that have all culverts located and inspected.

4.1.1.2. – Draft Project Schedule (Attachment 4)

MTU provided a project schedule document to the committee showing the agreed upon Tasks 1-10. Task 1 will be changed and will be extended to the middle of July. Tasks 2 and 3 will involve getting the data into the database, and Task 3 will be extended and an asset management step will be added. Tasks 7 and 8 CSS and MTU will work together to complete.

Action Item: MTU will follow up with CSS to assure this schedule meets their needs.

4.1.1.3. – Attributes Collected by Local Agencies from the Survey (Attachment 5)

MTU shared documents showing the characteristics that were collected by the agencies in Tier 2 (Q6) and Tier 3 (Q12) that completed the culvert survey.

4.1.1.4. – Collection Attribute Checklist from Draft Work Program (Attachment 6)

For the inventory hand-out, the Michigan Geographic Framework (MGF) database information was taken from the MGF DTMB presentation. The information to be collected is shown on the table under “TAMC Culvert Pilot (per 2-22-18 meeting).”

4.1.1.5. – Financial Distribution Methods (Attachment 7)

MTU has pulled together four (4) possible ways in order to spend the \$2 million in the short time and meet the objective of the project: 1.) Managed Participant Selection with Alternates, 2.) Bounty System (Fixed or Variable), 3.) A Lottery, and 4.) Fixed Grant. Through these options, the goal would be to get a good sample of data, equity in the selection of participants, expedience in execution, ability to spend all funds without over spending, likelihood of a controlled project that can be successfully managed, and administrative complexity. It was decided that the funding will be distributed through the Regional

Planning Organizations (RPOs). The regions can do the work under their current work plan, but their contracts will need to be amended to increase funding in those areas selected to participate. After finding out the details that have been decided by the committee, some agencies may decide that they do not want to participate or cannot afford to participate in the project. Roger Belknap, TAMC Coordinator, can discuss this during his Regional Coordinators quarterly calls and get some feedback from the regions. There are 39 Tier 1, 33 Tier 2, and 9 Tier 3 (mostly counties) volunteer agencies. The majority are using Roadsoft, others are using GIS, spreadsheets or paper files to house their culvert data. The committee decided to use \$1.5 million for data collection, with the remaining funds used to cover MTU, CSS, and support staff costs, bringing the total close to the \$2 million allotted funding.

4.1.2. – MTU-CTT Draft Work Plan

MTU drafted a work plan to handle tasks needed by MTU to complete the project. Some of the top tasks that MTU will have are as follows: developing and conducting the culvert training (hands-on or webinars). They are proposing to hold trainings in a couple of locations for agencies to do hands-on training. A possible way to save on training costs is to conduct trainings via Webinars. It was decided to use Roadsoft as the collection database. The pilot data collection will amount to another 20% of the cost. The evaluation of the pilot is 16% and the statewide cost estimate is 12%. Pilot centralized storage solution amounts to 5%. The committee will need to get the report completed prior to November 2018.

4.1.3. – Selection Process for Participants

J. Johnson made a motion to use the Statewide Bounty System for all 81 volunteer agencies with the distribution of funds to be determined by tiers; D. Disselkoen seconded the motion. J. Johnson, D. Disselkoen, and W. Harrall supported the motion; B. Vilmont, A. Halbeisen, R. Curtis, and K. Cooper did not support the motion. The issues of non-support were funding may not be sufficient to cover all 81 agencies, the 81 agencies may not agree to the \$11 per culvert estimated reimbursement rate.

A revised motion was made by B. Vilmont to fund, at amounts to be determined later, all Tier 3 agencies statewide, and the Tier 1 and 2 agencies within the West Michigan Regional Planning Commission, the East Michigan Council of Governments, and the Northwest Michigan Council of Governments. After these selected agencies have agreed to participate and the resources allocated, any remaining funding will be distributed through the bounty system to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 agencies in the remaining planning regions. J. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

4.1.4. – Determination of Inventory Data to Collect and Report

The statewide data collected was: location, condition, surface type, length, size, shape, skew, and depth of the cover. For the 21st Century pilot, it was ID, length, size, shape, material,

condition, surface, construction date, contributor (what jurisdiction), and collection type.

When agencies are inventorying, if they have multiple culverts at one location, they must inventory all of the culverts separately. Even if a road does not have culverts, the agency must do a segment-by-segment drive and list all of those roads as well, and document that the roads do not have culverts.

J. Johnson made a motion to approve the collection of the following data fields as listed in Attachment 6-TAMC Culvert Pilot (per 2-22-18 meeting): Inventory ID, GPS Coordinates, Material Type, Asset Collection Date, Shape, Skew Angle, Length, Span, Rise, Depth of Cover, Height/Diameter, Width, Surface Type, and Culvert Rating.; B. Vilmont seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

Action Item: MTU and CSS will work together on adding the necessary fields onto the database to hold the collected data.

4.1.5. – Determination of Condition Evaluation Methods

The Committee decided to use the Federal Highway Administrations ratings guidance. J. Johnson made a motion to proceed with the recommendation as presented. A. Halbeisen seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

K. Cooper made a motion to support the condition evaluation: blockage, scour, and barrel; B. Vilmont seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. Any aprons and any spots in the barrel, end conditions (scour), blockage or erosion, and barrel conditions can control the overall culvert. They can use the blockage or erosion rating scale of 0-10. A lot of culverts do not have end sections and the agencies will leave the field blank. Some of the newer culverts have end sections, but the older culverts usually do not have them. Older culverts usually have just straight ends. If there are 100,000 culverts TAMC could possibly offer \$15 per culvert. The total number of agencies are: 35 total agencies – 17 counties, 13 cities, and 5 additional agencies in Tier 3.

J. Johnson, TAMC Chair, would like MTU to do the calculations based on discussions and information from the survey, and make a final decision on cost per culvert and equipment costs, if necessary, to offer agencies. She would like MTU to inform the full Council at the April 11, 2018, meeting of the decision that was made.

Action Item: S. Bershing and C. Gilbertson will work on some figures in order to determine the funding amounts that TAMC can offer the regions to complete the culvert project.

4.2. – TAMC Bridge Committee 201 Meeting Schedule – R. Curtis

The next TAMC Bridge Committee meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2018, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.. The committee would like to extend the meeting time on the same date to 1:00 p.m. –

5:00 p.m. The Committee added another meeting date of June 19, 2018, 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., to the schedule to discuss any issues and find out the status of how the data collection is proceeding. The Committee left the July 26, 2018, meeting as is; no date or time changes needed at this time. The Committee will discuss whether or not a meeting will be necessary in August at their July meeting.

5. Correspondence and Announcements:

5.1. – TAMC 2018 Spring Conference, May 22, 2018, Grand Traverse Resort and Spa, Traverse City, Michigan (Attachment 8)

Final preparations are being made for the conference and everything is going along smoothly.

Action Item: TAMC Conference Committee needs a Bridge Committee member to be on the Bridge panel at the conference.

5.2. – 2018 Michigan Bridge Conference, Ann Arbor, March 20, 2018

D. Jennett did the TAMC presentation at the bridge conference and everything went very well.

5.3. – Bridge Asset Management Workshop Update – C. Gilbertson

C. Gilbertsen has the dates for the workshops and will send them to G. Strong to forward to the committee members. They were given out at the March 20, 2018, Bridge Conference. K. Cooper will be attending the April 15, 2018, Bridge Workshop.

Action Item: C. Gilbertsen will send G. Strong the Bridge Asset Management Workshops schedule to forward to the Bridge Committee members.

6. Public Comments:

None

7. Member Comments:

None

8. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m. The next meeting will be held April 19, 2018, at 1:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, Lansing.

FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN’S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)

CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.03.08.2017.GMS